1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Donald H. Nichols, MN State Bar No. 78918 (admitted pro hac vice) Paul J. Lukas, MN State Bar No. 22084X (admitted pro hac vice) Tim C. Selander, MN Bar No. 0387016 (admitted pro hac vice) NICHOLS KASTER & ANDERSON, PLLP 4600 IDS Center 80 S. 8 th Street Minneapolis, MN 55402 Bryan J. Schwartz, CA State Bar No. 209903 Matthew C. Helland, CA State Bar No. 2504: NICHOLS KASTER & ANDERSON, LLP One Embarcadero Center, Ste. 720 San Francisco, CA 94111	
9	Attorneys for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs	
10	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	Philip Wong, Frederic Chaussy, Leslie Marie Shearn, and Chad Barbiere,	Case No.: 3:07-cv-2446 MMC
13	individually, on behalf of all others similarly situated, and on behalf of the general public,	DECLARATION OF BRYAN J. SCHWARTZ, ESQ., IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS
14		CERTIFICATION
15	Plaintiffs,	•
16	vs.	
17	HSBC Mortgage Corporation (USA); HSBC Bank USA, N.A.; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,	
18	Defendants.	
19	Defendants.	
20		
21		
22	1. I am counsel for the Plaintiffs in this matter, over 18 years old, and competent to testify.	
23	2. I certify that Exhibit 1 represents a true and correct copy of Robert Lampka deposition	
24		
25	excerpts.	
26	3. I certify that Exhibit 2 represents a true and correct copy of the declaration of Godwin	
27	Tsui.	
28		DECLADATION OF DOVAN 1 SCHWADTZ ESO

Declaration of Bryan J. Schwartz, Esq., C 07-2446 MMC

21

23

25

26

27

28

excerpts.

- 16. I certify that **Exhibit 15** represents a true and correct copy of a redacted declaration regarding a putative class member's fear of reprisal which prevented him/her from joining the FLSA opt-in class.
- 17. I certify that Exhibit 16 represents a true and correct copy of Stanfield, et al. v. First NLC Financial Services, LLC, C 06-3892 SBA, Dkt. #324 (N.D. Cal. December 21, 2007) (Armstrong, J).
- 18. I certify that **Exhibit 17** represents a true and correct copy of sample emails regarding Defendants' minimum loan production requirements.
- 19. I certify that **Exhibit 18** represents a true and correct copy of sample emails regarding Defendants' deduction policy at issue in this case.
- 20. I certify that **Exhibit 19** represents a true and correct copy of Susan Marczak deposition excerpts.
- 21. I certify that **Exhibit 20** represents true and correct copies of examples of recent mortgage industry news, discussing how hundreds of lenders have shut their doors, and thousands of loan officers nationwide have lost their jobs.
- 22. I certify that **Exhibit 21** represents a true and correct copy of an excerpt from HSBC's website from 2008 ("HSBC has jumped two places to top the latest Forbes 2000 list of the world's largest companies...") available on-line at: http://www.hsbc.com/1/2/newsroom/news/news-archive-2008/hsbc-tops-forbes-2000-list-of-world-s-largest-companies.
- 23. I certify that **Exhibit 22** represents a true and correct copy of an HSBC Group Fact Sheet from March 2008.

- 24. I certify that **Exhibit 23** represents a true and correct copy of an excerpt from HSBC's website, "About HSBC Bank USA, NA," available on-line at http://www.us.hsbc.com/1/2/3/personal/inside/about.
- 25. I certify that **Exhibit 24** represents a true and correct copy of Duties of Class Representatives agreements signed by Plaintiffs.
- 26. Plaintiffs will submit their proposed Notice of Class Action as Exhibit 25.
- 27. I am informed and believe that, of more than 110 people who joined the FLSA class in this case, and more than 200 current employees of Defendants who were members of the putative FLSA class, only approximately six (6) opt-ins are current employees of Defendants.
- 28. A host of current HSBC employees have conveyed to the undersigned and, I am informed and believe, to other employees of Nichols Kaster, that they would like to claim the overtime to which they are entitled, but fear joining the suit because they fear retaliation from HSBC and cannot afford to risk their careers, in such a precarious job market for mortgage loan officers. Individuals have conveyed to the undersigned and, I am informed and believe, to other employees of Nichols Kaster, that they feel that their jobs are always in jeopardy. These employees have likewise conveyed that their general impression is that they may recover relatively little from this action, such that they certainly cannot justify risking their careers. My firm has encouraged employees interested in vindicating their rights to opt-in, and advised them not to fear unlawful retaliation, but we only rarely succeed in persuading putative class members who fear retaliation that joining publicly is worth the perceived "risk."
- 29. Both current and former employees have expressed to the undersigned, and, I am informed and believe, to other employees of Nichols Kaster, that they fear that they could not only lose their jobs with Defendants, but be "blackballed" (foreclosed from working) in the mortgage loan industry as a whole.

28

30. One intimidated current employee had the courage to provide a declaration regarding such intimidation, with the promise that the declaration would be submitted only in redacted form, made available for the Court to review unredacted in camera. See Exhibit 15. Plaintiffs' counsel's experience is that this witness' willingness to sign a declaration is unusual – but his/her reasons for not submitting a consent form in the FLSA opt-in matter are common.

- I am informed and believe that the putative classes in California and New Jersey each 31. have approximately 60 or more members, and the New York putative class has more than 350 members. These minimum estimates are based upon lists of class members provided to Plaintiffs after the FLSA action was conditionally certified, based upon the locations where the putative class members reside. These numbers do not include putative class members who were exclusively employed by Defendants more than three years ago (i.e., outside the FLSA statute) in California and New York, or who were exclusively employed by Defendants since Defendants last provided a list of FLSA class members.
- I am informed and believe that no divergence exists between the interests of the proposed 32. Class Representatives and the interests of the Class as a whole. Neither the Plaintiffs nor any of the other putative class members have an interest in individually controlling the prosecution of separate actions.
- Plaintiffs' counsel has been actively and diligently pursuing this matter, with the 33. cooperation of the Class Representatives. Counsel is qualified and experienced, and generally able to conduct the proposed litigation. In particular, Nichols Kaster is a 20+ lawyer firm based in San Francisco, CA, and Minneapolis, MN, which concentrates its practice on representing employees with a wide variety of employment claims, with a special focus on wage and hour class and collective action litigation. Donald Nichols and Paul Lukas are partners of the firm, and Bryan Schwartz, Matthew Helland, and Timothy Selander are associates, all with extensive

Declaration of Bryan J. Schwartz, Esq., C 07-2446 MMC

in wage/hour actions. The firm, and these attorneys in particular, have served as Class Counsel and succeeded in obtaining results on behalf of classes of employees with wage/hour claims, approved by Courts nationwide, recently by the Northern District of California in **Stanfield**, et al. v. First NLC Financial Services, LLC, C 06-3892 SBA, Dkt. #324 (N.D. Cal. December 21, 2007) (Armstrong, J).

34. I am informed and believe that no conflicting litigation concerning the controversy as to

experience in actions such as this, having represented tens of thousands of employees nationwide

loan officers has been commenced. Because Defendants refused to stipulate to allowing late optins to join this suit, and because Defendants refused to stipulate to expanding the class list to include other mortgage sales employees not called "loan officers," the undersigned initiated another suit, which supports the instant case's allegations, in the Eastern District of New York. That suit is entitled, Graf, et al. v. HSBC Mortgage Corporation (USA), et al., 2:08-cv-03022 (SJF-AKT), and was filed July 22, 2008.

35. Concentrating the wage/hour litigation in a class action will avoid multiple suits, since, if this motion is denied, the undersigned will be required to, and plans to immediately, join or file new individual state claims on behalf of every opt-in class member who worked in New York, New Jersey, and California (more than 80 people, I am informed and believe). The undersigned would seek further to file additional suits on behalf of the estimated 500+ putative class members (I am informed and believe) who are not opt-in plaintiffs (including those who were never notified of the FLSA action, see infra), if possible. I am informed and believe that at least 40+ Californians, 50+ New Jersey residents, and 300+ New Yorkers are putative Rule 23 class members who did not opt-into the FLSA collective action.

4 5

7

8

6

9 10

12

11

13

14

15

17

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

- Many New York and California putative class members outside the FLSA statute of 36. limitations were never notified of the suit at all, and many who did receive notice were deterred by fear and impracticability, as discussed supra.
- The potential liability of Defendants can be calculated (and has been estimated for current 37. opt-ins) based on Plaintiffs' and putative class members' rate of pay, time worked, good-faith overtime estimates, and pay records regarding \$325 deductions. Average wage loss claims in California, New York, and New Jersey are approximately \$40,000, with the smallest claim a mere \$750 and some claims worth only several thousand dollars.
- Based my experience and the collective experience of my firm, Nichols Kaster, across 38. dozens of trials, we have found that attorneys' fees to litigate an individual matter through trial rarely if ever sink below \$100,000.
- I am informed and believe, based on my discussions and those of my colleagues with 39. would-be class members, that Defendants' loan officers generally were misled to believe, and commonly believed, that salespersons who are eligible for commissions cannot earn overtime regardless of their job duties.
- 40. I am informed and believe, based on my discussions and those of my colleagues with would-be class members in this and other cases, that individual employees and former employees, unlike consumers and borrowers who raise class claims (for example), often have emotional barriers to accusing supervisors of denying them overtime - not wanting to "get anyone in trouble." This is because frequently employees remain friendly or on positive terms with former supervisors, even those who denied them overtime pay, and fear they might harm these managers with their case.
- I am informed and believe, based on my experience in this and similar cases, that the 41. mortgage lending industry generally has extremely high turnover and the average length of

26

27

28

employment is short-term. Based on data from current opt-in Plaintiffs and limited discovery provided by Defendants, I am informed and believe that the average length of employment for Defendants' California loan officers was approximately one year, while the average length of employment for Defendants' New York and New Jersey loan officers was approximately two years.

- I am informed and believe that the Plaintiffs have no conflict of interest with other Class 42. Members, and that they have and will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the Class. See Exhibit 24.
- Based on my experience in actions such as this, and that of my firm, Nichols Kaster, I am 43. informed and believe that service of the proposed Notice of Class Action, by first-class Mail, postage prepaid, to each member of the Class at the member's last-known address as shown on the Defendants' records, is the best notice practicable under all the circumstances.
- I attended the deposition of Plaintiff Leslie Shearn in New York City, New York, on 44. September 3, 2008, and, to the best of my recollection, she testified that she has suffered pay deductions when she waived customers' \$325 loan application fees in order to obtain loan sales at Defendants. The parties are currently awaiting a transcript of this recent testimony. Plaintiffs can provide relevant transcript excerpts upon the Court's request when the final transcript becomes available.
- Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Bryan Schwartz